

S H O U L D
THE
North Carolina Conference
BE
D I V I D E D ?

A R E P L Y

TO THE

Criticisms of Revs. S. D. Adams and W. S. Chaffin,

— BY —

REV. J. E. MANN.

1885 :

Printed at the "Messenger" Steam Book and Job Printing House
GOLDSBORO, N. C.

EXPLANATORY.

READ AND SEE.

At the unanimous request of the members of the New Berne District Conference, I furnished for publication in the *Raleigh Advocate* and *Methodist Advance*, a speech I made in favor of a division of the N. C. Conference, and the Editor of the *Advocate* admitted into the columns of his paper ten or twelve articles, criticising myself and speech, to which action on his part, I never offered one word of objection; as I supposed his sense of justice and fair dealing would allow me, in due time, an opportunity to make suitable reply. He allowed those opposed to division to assail me with sentences like the following :

“When men profess to state facts and have the opportunity of knowing them, they ought not to pervert them. But above all things, a clergyman ought not to falsify the record.” * * * “If I am correct (and I defy denial on the part of any man) then the record *was perverted—was falsified*. I did not say *wilfully* perverted. But if *I* had made the assertion, *with my knowledge of the facts*, then *I* would have *criminally* falsified the record.”

I only quote the above to show something of the latitude the Editor of the *Advocate* allowed the other side—as I never proposed to ask for space in a religious paper to reply to it. I simply give the above to show the “*rule*” the Editor held for the other side in their criticisms on

myself and speech. I knew the Editor and Owner of our Conference Organ was thoroughly opposed to a division of the Conference, but I never once supposed he was so biased, as to be capable of using his position as a partisan in a discussion in his columns of an old Conference question. I only expected reasonable fairness. I did not claim nor expect any advantage from the fact that I had always stood by him and faithfully tried to help him build up his paper but I thought his sense of propriety as the Editor of our Conference Organ—if nothing more—would secure me a fair showing. Accordingly, I wrote my reply, and to suit his editorial convenience, divided it into four articles, and in due time sent them all to him. If there was any thing that ought to have been considered more objectionable in any one of the articles than the rest I did not know it. But I see now. My 3rd article probed to the *bottom* of the question and struck the ground on which the real opposition of the *leaders* against division rests, viz: *The convenience of the fixtures of the middle section of our Conference.* My ~~two~~^{two} first articles were published and after keeping my third until it should have, in due course, gone in type, the Editor wrote me, that it was so “purely and offensively personal,” it would “violate his RULE to publish it.”

He did not offer me the privilege of my revising it, or point out what portion of it he considered objectionably personal. I at once wrote him demanding that he finish publishing my reply—but if he declined to do so to return my manuscript that I might publish it. He returned my 3rd with a statement that my 4th was in type. It was in that way he proposed to inflict on myself and the friends of division the two-fold injury of needlessly rejecting one article of my reply

and of publishing a *maimed, cut-in-two* discussion, *as* my reply—which outrage I refused by telegram to allow. I am thus shut out from all opportunity of reaching the numerous readers of the *Advocate*, where the unfair assaults of my unbridled assailants have gone and are still going, and shut up to the necessity of publishing my reply, if I reply, at all, at my own private expense—and all because I have the temerity to affirm and the presumption to argue that justice to the many, is preferable, to favoritism to the few, and that the chief interests of the Church of God should not be held in subordination to the private claims of individuals. Read, and see for yourself, what it is the owner of the Conference Organ objects to your reading in his paper.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRANSFER QUESTION.

ARTICLE FIRST.

MR. EDITOR: On returning home from my third round, on my District. after holding in 8 weeks 17 Quarterly Meetings, of two days each; I find accumulated on my table, in your paper, 19 columns of criticisms on the speech I made before my District Conference at Morehead, in favor of a division of the N. C. Conference. That I spoke at all, is made the subject of animadversion by my accusing brethren. As it is conceded, that at least one other Presiding Elder of the N. C. Conference, under similar circumstances, made a speech against division, and my critics pass him by unnoticed, it plainly appears, that it was not so much that I spoke, that gave offense, as, that I spoke on the wrong side of the subject, to suit my censors, and had something to say, when I spoke. And pray, when did any preacher in the N. C. Conference surrender his right to express his views on a Conference subject? The agitation of the division question was begun for the Conference year, as the columns of the *ADVOCATE* show, by those *opposed* to division, and the subject was introduced as a proper one into the first District Conference, (Washington) and those opposed to division seem never to have concluded that it was not a suitable subject for District Conference, until my District Conference voted almost unanimously for division. The Judge told the Farmer you know: "It makes a very great difference as to WHOSE OX is gored."

I had no one of my brethren, of N. C. Conference, even in my mind while speaking, and called none of their names—was simply discussing the general principle of the question, as might have been seen, and if by his combined assault on me by name and wholesale vilification of the profound convictions I have entertained for years, I am to understand that there are a few in the N. C. Conference who venture to assume to dictate what convictions the others of the Conference are to entertain on all Conference questions, and what views express and *when* and *where* express them, I will here inform my censors that they have greatly mistaken their own abilities and the character of the members of the N. C. Conference.

Bro. Adams objects to the *circumstances* of the appearance of my speech in public print, and gives these as a reason why he wrote his criticism on it. Hear him :

“But even all that would not have induced me to write had not that speech made its appearance at the Fayetteville District Conference, just at the opening of its session, publicly announced as containing arguments, simply unanswerable, and as coming from a man remarkably careful and conservative, and in that way was used to impress the mind, when there was no time to examine it, and no opportunity to answer its arguments.”

I am very sorry Bro. Adams has allowed himself to do an old true personal friend, the very great injustice, of holding him responsible for circumstances over which he had no control, and with which he had nothing to do whatever, and making these very circumstances the ground of an effusion, whose rancor of spirit is a surprise to many who had thought him a different man. If he had told us, in the above, he wrote from settled convictions as to the merits of the question discussed, there would have been more excuse for

him and his utterances. Now let me tell Bro. Adams: I sent the manuscript of my speech for publication to *Raleigh Advocate* June 25th, and the *Advance* June 26th, with the request to both to publish as soon as convenient, and if the convenience of these papers did not allow the papers to furnish him, in his own home, where he might have had time to examine my speech before the 2nd week in July, it was not my fault. I did not take or send my speech to his District Conference. I do not know, even now, who was guilty of the crime of carrying printed matter to the Fayetteville District Conference. I never authorized any one to announce, or praise my speech, or myself. I never said my speech was unanswerable, nor told any one else to say so—and did not suspect that it was completely so, until I saw the failures of its assailants, and their dodges to avoid its main arguments.

By referring to my speech, you will see, that as a preliminary to my discussion of the necessity for the division of our Conference, I made as a reason why I was now in favor of its division, the following statement, as a statement of historical fact, and as a proposition for the preliminary argument, viz:

“I. Because the formation of a Western N. C. Conference would be in accordance with the real and expressed object of the cutting off of the Shelby and Charlotte Districts from the S. C. Conference in 1870.”

To unfold this leading statement, as a reason why I was in favor of a division on the ground of the object of the cutting off, I made under this leading statement, several brief statements, as statements of cognate historical facts. I here reproduce the ones chiefly objected to :

"It is well remembered by many of us, and may be seen from the files of the papers of that period, that all the resolutions, appeals and petitions going up from the bounds of the N. C. Conference, and the N. C. portion of the S. C. Conference" (that is, all those referring to the transfer of the S. C. Conference territory, as a territory) "set forth distinctly, that the great thing needed, and desired by very many of our people, was the formation of a Western N. C. Conference." "A move, backed up by evidence that it was greatly desired, was made in the General Conference of 1870 and led the Gen. Conference to the action of cutting off the Shelby and Charlotte Districts from the S. C. Conference, so that this "new" "homogeneous" "Western N. C. Conference," so much desired, could be formed." "We asked the Gen. Conference to cut off the Shelby and Charlotte Districts, for the specific purpose of forming a new Conference. The Gen. Conference cut off and handed them to us, for the purpose we had set forth and urged, on the strength of evidence we had furnished, that it was our purpose to form the new Conference." "The formation of the new Conference, with any discretion as to time allowed, was committed to the N. C. Conference, because the new Conference was to be in N. C. and the N. C. Conference was so clearly, and openly, committed to the formation of the new Conference."

From the above, and like, cognate historical facts, as may be seen in my speech, I drew the conclusion that: "*We as a Conference are therefore in truth and honor bound to carry out the purpose of the trust committed to us by the Gen. Conference of 1870.*" I believe the few, who object most violently to my speech, admit that the *substantiation* of the above statements would inevitably carry with it the *conclusion* I drew. Now, let the reader hold right here, while I tell him: I now have in my possession the evidence to establish beyond a reasonable doubt, every one of the above historical statements. I will also be able to establish the additional historical fact. that our failure in the General Conference to obtain the Holston territory to put into a new Conference did not cause us to relinquish, in any degree, the hold gotten on the S. C. territory, but after

the Shelby and Charlotte Districts were cut off in the committee room, for the purpose of a new Conference we *resisted* in the General Conference room the return of their territory to their mother Conference, and sought these Districts *still* at the *hands* of the General Conference, for the *same* "*expressed*" *purpose of forming a new Conference.*

In making my speech, I had no desire to open a discussion of the transfer question, but the transfer question is the division question, as far as it goes, and stands unalterably fixed at the beginning of it, and its consideration is necessary to a full understanding of the division question. Hence, I briefly discussed it in my speech. But for my brief statements of historical facts I have been soundly abused by my critics, who seem to wince terribly under them. Bro. Adams says I am "wrong" "badly wrong" "mistaken" "the facts are against" me and accuses me of misrepresenting the facts of the official record and of the most glaring misrepresentations. After seeing all these harsh terms and unkind words applied to me, the reader will be surprised, when he turns and reads my speech, to see, as he will see by so doing, that in the discussion of this whole transfer question, I never referred *once* to the "*official*" or *any other* "record" whatever—except, to "the files of the papers of that period." The circumstances of an incidental speech at a District Conference did not reasonably admit of an introduction at every single point I made, of all the documentary evidence of the case, and I did not suppose that we had any one in our Church ignorant enough to think that the Journal of our General Conference contained descriptive captions over its recorded acts, defining the objects of its actions, or that we had any one de-

proved enough, to pretend that there were such things when he knew there were not, but I knew my proposition was true and that there was no record in the Journal of Gen. Conference that was not in accord with the truth (as we shall see hereafter) of the very statement I made. My leading statement of fact, was that the "real and expressed *object*" "of the cutting off" of the S. C. Conference territory was *the formation of a new Conference.*" The *object* of an action, or series of conjoint actions is *the thing held before the mind* by the actors as the *end* or *aim* of the action. "Expressed object" is when the thing before the mind of an actor is *put in language.* The *responsibility* of an action rests on the *agents* of an action. Therefore the responsibility of the cutting of the S. C. territory rests on the agents of the action. These agents were many of our laity and ministry and Conference Organ, at home, and our representatives in Gen. Conference, and the Gen. Conference itself. The *power* to form an Annual Conference and fix its boundaries is lodged in the Gen. Conference, but as that is a *representative* body and acknowledges the right of petition and appeal to all our laity, preachers and subordinate bodies this power is *most frequently brought into action* by the petitions, appeals and requests of Church members, preachers and representatives, from the special sections interested. *This was the case as we will see in the transfer of the S. C. territory to form a new Conference.* Bro. Adams says he wants "facts"—"I am after facts, you see," in this discussion. I will say, for his special gratification, I will now give him, as much as he desires of what he seeks, and for his edification in the *use* of the term "fact" that Webster says: "*A fact is a thing doing, or done, an act, an event.*" I will give facts, all along the transfer move-

ment, from its inception to the Greensboro Conference in 1870, and show the *object* of it, and our relation to it. I said in my speech, that the "files of papers of that period," would show something of what I said, and I will now show you what I said was true. But I will not confine myself to the printed facts in the papers of that day, but I will give him some facts of "the records," and some not ~~there~~ therefore recorded, but he shall have "facts." Lest he forgot how to number them, to see how many are "against him," I will number them for him and apply them as we go on.

THE ORIGIN AND DIRECTION OF THE MOVEMENT.

1st Fact: I was P. C. of the Mocksville Circuit, Salisbury District, during the years 1866-67 and 68, Dr. Wm. Closs was my P. E. I attended District Conference, during the time, at Snow Creek, Iredell county, and while there heard Rev. Dr. W. Closs, P. E. of the District, present to a number of the officials of his own District and some brethren from the Shelby District, S. C. Conference, the importance and practicability of forming a homogeneous Western N. C. Conference out of the Salisbury District, N. C. Conference, and the N. C. territory of the S. C. and Holston Conferences, and stated to his S. C. Conference friends, he was going over into their territory, at an appointed time, and make a speech on the subject—which visit and speech he did make—as he afterwards told me, and to which others can now testify. I give this fact to show, that this transfer movement was *originated* in the bounds of the N. C. Conference, and by a prominent member of the N. C. Conference, and that it was carried over by him into the bounds of the S. C. territory, and that the whole *object* from its very inception was a Western N. C. Conference.

RESOLUTION OF SALISBURY DISTRICT CONFERENCE, HELD
AT JONESVILLE.

2nd Fact: Sept. 1869. (See *R. E. Methodist*—then Organ of N. C. Conference—Sept. 27th, 1869.)

"The following resolution was offered by Rev. M. L. Wood, and unanimously adopted: *Resolved*, That, in the judgment of this District Conference, it would greatly promote the cause of Christ, and Methodism in particular, in the State of N. C., if a Western N. C. Conference was constituted, and that we await, with anxious interest, the move in that direction, of the laity of the Church, in those parts of the State within the bounds of the S. C. and Holston Conference."

Is this *official* enough for Bro. Adams? How does he like the record of the Salisbury District? What was the object of their official invitation to the laity of the other territory in our State in the West to agitate "move"—and published in our official organ and sent to all our people, and over into that territory? What would "promote the cause of Christ" and of Methodism in particular? *A new Conference*. For what did that unanimous Conference await with anxious interest? *A move of the laity over in that territory in that direction* Rev. Dr. M. L. Wood, the present P. E. of the territory "moved," in the Shelby District, can no doubt recollect the enthusiasm of the Salisbury District Conference on the occasion, and the unanimity with which it passed his resolution.

3rd Fact: Extract from an Editorial in Organ of N. C. Conference, Oct. 13th, 1869:

"NEW CONFERENCE. If there is to be an effort made to urge this matter upon the next General Conference, it is proper that the people should petition that body, to effect it, and it is time their petitions were drawn up and handed around for signatures."

As, the then Editor of the Conference Organ could

not have been said to be in favor, personally, of the New Conference, whose sentiments did he know he uttered here? Why, those of the majority of the N. C. Conference—and the members of the Conference read these sentiments of theirs and gave the Editor a hearty endorsement at Conference *in view* of them. The Organ was then the selected official medium employed by the Conference to “urge this matter upon the next General Conference,” and the Organ had learned that there was an “effort to be made,” and it opens its mouth and lets the N. C. Conference speak out to the people and tell them *how* and *when* to “urge this matter,” so as “to effect it,” let “the petitions” be gotten “up” and “handed around for signatures”—“it is *time* they were drawn up and handed around.”

4th Fact: Extract from an Editorial in Conference Organ January 5th, 1870:

“From what we have said on this subject, our readers must have plainly inferred, that we were committed entirely to the formation of a new Conference, out of territory in Western N. C. lying in the N. C., S. C, and Holston Conferences, whenever the people in that territory desired it... And we say to Bro. Abernethy and the rest: Go ahead and we will back up their determination. They may expect from the Raleigh Episcopal Methodist all the support and aid which it can render.”

In this we see the *plan* of the Conference “to urge this matter upon the General Conference,” so as “to effect it, spoken through its mouth, Conference Organ, *is working* finely Bro. R. L. Abernethy, a local preacher over in the bounds of the Shelby District, S. C. Conference where Dr. Closs went to make his speech—and the rest” had gotten “up” petitions and were “handing them around” and Bro. Abernethy had begun to employ his talents as a writer and has written, as we will see here after, to tell the Organ how they

are all at work, *as advised*. The Conference Organ now leaves no question as to where it stands, but declares it is now *committed entirely* and calls on all to "*go ahead*" and promises to "back them up" and tells them to look for all the "aid" the Organ can give as an Organ.

Here, the reader will see, is one of the many ways in which the N. C. Conference was *committed to the cutting off of the S. C. Conference territory and the formation of the new Conference*—can here see, it was committed, *as far as it possibly could be through its own official Organ*. The convened session need not take any action by resolution—it was *already* working a plan, which all *knew* was working *effectively*. Our Conference resolution was to *endorse the Organ*, and let the plan inaugurated work on with the promised "backing up" and "aid" and "support." Yet Bro. Adams says our Conference was "committed to nothing—free as the fowls of the air."

5th Fact: Resolution of Quarterly Conference of Marion Station, S. C. Conference, Jan. '70. (Published in R. E. Meth. Jan. 1870.)

"Resolved by this Quarterly Conference of Marion, (N. C.) Station, S. C. Conference, that our delegates to the General Conference, be requested to take into consideration the forming of a new Conference, to be called the Western N. C. Conference, from such territory as now belongs to the Salisbury District, N. C., and all territory in N. C. belonging to the S. C. and Holston Conferences."

Here is an official resolution going up from the bounds of the N. C. portion of S. C. Conference, addressed to delegates to Gen. Conference, and asking *specifically* for a new Conference out of their territory.

6th Fact: Resolution of Quarterly Conference of Lenoir, (N. C.) Circuit S. C. Conference. (Published in R. E. Meth., April 27th, 1870.):

“WHEREAS the Nashville *Christian Advocate* published a comprehensive article from the pen of Rev. J. E. Kennedy, of the Holston Conference, on the subject of Conference Boundaries, addressed to the General Conference delegates elect, from the Holston, N. C., and S. C. Conferences, and recommended the formation of a Western N. C. Conference; and Whereas, in our judgment, all the considerations necessary to be presented are brought to view in the aforesaid article therefore, *Resolved* by the official members of this Quarterly Conference, that we adopt the sentiments of the article, as expressing our views. *Resolved* 2nd, That the Secretary of this Conference forward to....Montgomery, one of our lay delegates to the General Conference; to assemble at Memphis, a copy of these resolutions, together with Rev. Mr. Kennedy’s article; also a copy to the Editor of the Raleigh *Episcopal Methodist* for publication.”

Signed in behalf of the Quarterly Conference of Lenoir Circuit, S. C. Conference.

E. J. MEYNARDIE, President.

G. W. ROUND, Secretary.

I hope this is *official* enough for Bro. Adams.

7th Fact: Extract from an article of Dr. A. A. Scroggs in Organ of N. C. Conference. (Published April 17th, 1870.):

“We are laboring and will labor for a Western North Carolina Conference—*not a transfer.*”

You see, Dr. Scroggs was a good consecrated, influential layman up in the Shelby District, (where Dr. Closs went that time,) who had been laboring with Bro. Abernethy, according to our plan for the new Conference, as suggested through our Organ. He just went “ahead,” when we called on “Bro. Abernethy and the rest” to do so, and promised, as we were “committed entirely” to the formation of the new Conference to “back up,” “support” and “aid him.” But the Gen. Conference, you see was going to meet in a few weeks,—the delegates start very soon. Dr. Scroggs seems to be thoughtfully meditating the labor he has performed for the new Conference of the N. C. Con-

ference people ; when lo ! some genius (perhaps the spirit of one of the old fathers who founded the Church up there under the mountains) whispered in his ear ! "Scroggs ! Suppose you never see a Western N. C. Conference ! Suppose all this work you have done is to result in cutting you and your family and friends off from the Conference and preachers through whose instrumentality you have all been converted, and that Conference down in the East, which offers *one* and seeks *five* Districts out of which to form the new Conference, just swallows you and your territory up, when they get it off, at the Gen. Conference, for their own Conference aggrandizement !" The Dr. no doubt failed to recognize what spirit this was and said : "Get thee hence" - but like a cautious physician as he was, he sat down and wrote the Organ and all the delegates : "We are laboring and will labor for a Western N. C. Conference—NOT A TRANSFER."

8th Fact : Extract from an article of Rev. R. L. Abernethy in Organ of Conference. (Published April, 1870):

"I am now penning my last article on Boundaries and a Western N. C. Conference. It is plainly to be seen, that all Western N. C., is ripe for a Western N. C. Conference. We have heard from all parts of this territory and the cry is! "Let us have a Western N. C. Conference." Bro. Kennedy and his P. E. from the Holston portion—Dr. A. Scroggs from Caldwell Circuit, N. C., and Burkhead from Salisbury Station, the editor of the *Christian Union*, Rutherfordton, N. C., and the humble writer of this article, have all spoken out plainly upon the subject.... But with Dr. Scroggs we all say: "If you do not intend giving us a new Conference let us alone as we are." Let all the petitions go up with some of our representatives. Let all see to this. Let the representatives from N. C. Conference, being readers of this paper and knowing the feelings of the Methodists in Western N. C., make a strong presentation of our claims to the General Conference."

Here is the man we had called on, *by name*, through our Conference Organ to "Go ahead" and said we would "aid" and "back up his determination" to urge the "New Conference" on the General Conference, reminding us, that he and all those who had united with him *demand*ed to be *let alone as they were* if a *New Conference* was not to be given them.

Dear reader, I will, for lack of space, have to suspend the consideration of this transfer question just here and conclude it in my next in which I will turn full light on the General Conference action.—*September 17th, 1885.*

1

ACTION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE ON THE TRANSFER QUESTION—LIGHT TURNED ON.

ARTICLE SECOND.

The scene of our investigation is changed, from N. C. to Memphis, the seat of the General Conference in session 1870. The delegates having arrived, the session opened, the committees formed, we find among the committeemen of the committee on Boundaries, Rev. W. H. Bobbitt of the N. C. Conference, and W. J. Montgomery of the S. C. Conference. Now let us see what facts we can, which will throw light on the object of the cutting off of the S. C. Conference territory and our relation to it.

10th Fact. Extract from an article of W. J. Montgomery in R. E. Meth., Nov. 9th, '70.

“Knowing prior to the assembling of the General Conference, that I was the only lay delegate from that portion of N. C. belonging to the S. C. Conference, I wrote a letter to every pastor in charge of circuits and stations, within said territory, personally appealing to them to find out and apprise me of the wishes of church members in their respective charges, in order that Western N. C. might not actually be unrepresented in the General Conference. Nearly all complied with my request. All these communications were laid before the Boundary Committee. I reported to the Committee that nearly all of N. C. lying west of Charlotte, were willing, some anxious, to get into a new conference, including that portion of N. C. in the Holston Conference, but were opposed to being transferred to the N. C. Conference.”

I introduce the above to show that official, or semi-official, communications went up to General Conference from “nearly all” the charges of the Shelby and

Charlotte Districts in the hands of their delegate, showing that all who were willing to be cut off from the S. C. Conference *wanted a new conference*, and *all were opposed to being transferred to become, permanently a part of the N. C. Conference*, and that their delegate laid all these communications before the committee on Boundaries, and re-affirmed personally to the committee, as a representative of these people, the truths their communications so clearly set forth.—These communications then all said : Give us a *new* Conference, *if you will*, but *do not make us a part of the N. C. Conference*.

10th Fact: The Petition from Members of our Church in Charlotte, presented by B. Craven, and referred to Committee on Boundaries. (See Journal, page 177:)

This stray petition from the bounds of the S. C. Conference in the hands of a member of the N. C. Conference, I contend, was either originally intended to be a part of the new Conference movement, and was looking to be transferred *in order* to form a new Conference, or it was looking to the isolation of the Charlotte Station from the rest of the surrounding church, as has been the case in other memberships. If it looked to mere insulation for the Charlotte Station, as we are left to infer, from its total lack of reference to the territory around it and lines to embrace said territory, it had no reference to the transferring, or not transferring, of the territory around it, and must not, therefore, be taken as an expression in opposition to the new conference. If it meant, after the N. C. Conference idea of forming a new conference, viz.: *Transfer and then form*—then I am willing to admit, that out of scores of petitions, from all over that territory, going up to General Conference, here is *one* and

only one, which had a *new conference* for its *real* object, and failed to express it, as the rest did. But if it was only seeking church isolation for the Charlotte Station it had no reference to the new conference movement, or transfer or non-transfer of the surrounding territory, whatever, and is therefore *outside* of this question altogether—and should have been kept so. That it did not mean opposition to the new conference movement, may be seen in the fact that 3 months and 4 days after the adjournment of the General Conference transferring this whole territory to the N. C. Conference, there was a District Conference held in Charlotte church, and every one of her representative members in the Conference, and every member of the District Conference, voted an “earnest” request to be set off by the N. C. Conference *from* the N. C. Conference at its next session, *into a New Conference*. (See Resolutions of District Conference in R. E. Meth. Sept. '70) Then let us hear no more of the Charlotte church being *opposed to the new conference*.

11th Fact. Extract from an article of Judge W. J. Montgomery, Advocate, Aug. 12th, '85.

“When the petitions asking to be transferred from the S. C. Conference were laid before the committee, I moved that the parts of N. C., in the Holston, Va. and S. C. Conferences, be added to the N. C. Conference, (thus putting the whole State together) and that the N. C. Conference be then equally divided. This was stoutly resisted by the committeemen of the Holston and Va. Conferences, and *successfully* upon the ground that the church in those bounds had not asked, and did not desire to be transferred.—When the committee became satisfied, that the church in the territory, which was transferred, desired to be transferred—were ripe for the change—the committee reported to the General Conference in favor of the transfer.”

The reader will recognize in the Judge, who wrote

the recent article, the "only lay delegate" who carried up to General Conference so many communications^s from the church members of the Shelby and Charlotte Districts, and laid them before the Boundary Committee. I do not know by the word *petitions*, in the above, whether he refers in this last article to the ones he carried up, or the one that came in from Charlotte church—if the latter he ought to have said *petition*. You will see the Judge here informs us *who* made the motion that cut off the Shelby and Charlotte Districts in the Boundary Committee. He says: "*I* moved." He tells us to what his move looked as its ultimate *object*: "That the North Carolina Conference be then equally *divided*" - that is *a new conference*. You will see the Judge had not then been with us long enough to fully imbibe our N. C. Conference idea of the steps to form a new conference, viz: Transfer, *in order*, or *then* divide—he called it "adding the parts together." The Holston and Va. committeemen understood it and called it "transferring"—but he says they resisted his motion "stoutly" and "*successfully*"—that is, we must infer they resisted parliamentarily, by amending the Judge's motion, by calling "adding together" "transfer" and taking their territory out and leaving the Judge's in—just as the report was when it came from the committee you see.

And here, with the very highest respect and tenderest regard for Judge Montgomery, as a Christian gentleman, I desire to remind him that during the lapse of more than 15 years, which have passed since the General Conference at Memphis, there is a circumstance in the matter, which seems to have passed out of his mind, that is, that he was sick during the closing labors of the Boundary Committee, and that Dr.

Walker from S. C., was, by consent, acting in his place, when the report referring to the boundary line between the N. C. and S. C. Conferences was finished. This being true I will show hereafter that Dr. Walker renewed Judge Montgomery's motion, as amended, or made the final motion in the committee, to transfer the S. C. Conference territory in N. C., to the N. C. Conference, with the distinct understanding in his own mind, and as he thought, clear agreement with many of the delegates immediately concerned, that the territory was to be formed into a new conference, either by the house when the report got before it, or by the N. C. Conference *ad iuterim*.

12th Fact: Report of Boundary Committee—as the Conference line now stands—as left by Dr. Walker's motion. (See Jour. p. 290.)

13th Fact. Dr. Shipp moved to recommit the items referring to the Holston, N. C., and S. C. Conferences. (See Jour. p. 294.)

As the above report left the Holston territory intact and the committee had already considered the question, J. M. McTeer of the Holston Conference, and Boundary Committee, moved to lay Dr. Shipp's motion on the table, which was done.

14th Fact: Dr. Shipp's Amendment—proposing a new conference. (See Jour. p. 194.)

This amendment proposed to embrace all of western N. C. down as far as, and *below Greensboro*, in the new conference. This was opposed by our delegates, as may be seen by their speeches. 1. Because the line proposed was distasteful to the Holston delegation who had fought it down in the committee. 2. Because the eastern line was not acceptable to the N. C. Con-

ference delegates, who had supposed that only the Salisbury District was to go from the N. C. Conference into the new conference formation. 3. Because they believed the eastern boundary line could be more satisfactorily arranged by *the N. C. Conference having control of the new conference formation after the adjournment of General Conference.*

Dr. N. F. Reid made a speech (see Advocate Aug. 5th, 1885) in which he referred to Dr. Shipp's proposed line as a "*remarkable Eastern Boundary,*" and objected to being considered committed to *Dr. Shipp's* plan for a line, and then called on the General Conference to "adopt the report of the committee" which turned over the S. C. Conference territory to the N. C. Conference, as "an opportunity of settling the question forever." *How* was the question to be settled forever? I think any one who knew Dr. Reid will admit that he was too intelligent a man to believe that the permanent transfer of 2 large Districts with their 30 preachers and 12,577 members, against their almost unanimous protestations, "would settle the question forever." If that was what he meant we could not believe that he would have tried to have *unsettled* the question that very afternoon, by bringing forward, for the adoption of the General Conference, a resolution authorizing the N. C. Conference to form that very territory into a Western N. C. Conference. Then we are forced to see that Dr. Reid meant by insisting on the General Conference to adopt the report of the committee, as a method of "settling the question forever," that the territory was to be turned over to the N. C. Conference, *to be formed by the N. C. Conference, ad interim, into a new conference.* Dr. W. H. Bobbitt, our representative, who was a Boundary committeeman, then

made a speech, which closed with the following sentences and words, (see his speech in R. E. Methodist of June 1870) viz:

“Now the best thing, and the only thing, that can be done, is to transfer this territory (Shelby and Charlotte Districts) to the North Carolina Conference, and we are perfectly willing to set this off into a new conference whenever this can be done. Let S. C. not be alarmed. I cannot and I will not harm her. I married the best wife in the world from the old territory of that Conference, and shall always have a warm affection for that people.”

Here is light for any who want to see! Here is the language of proposition and assent in as plain terms as it can be put in a short speech. Here are two of our delegates in General Conference, urging the body in the face of all the facts, to adopt this report, which transfers the S. C. territory to the N. C. Conference. What was the *object*? Was it “expressed?” What did they want this territory for? Let our boundary committeeman and representative on the floor answer—he is standing up there begging the General Conference to give us the territory by adopting the report at the very crisis of this transfer question—What does he want the territory transferred for? Hear him! “To set this off into a new conference.” Cannot something else be done? Can it not be let stay with the mother conference, where it asked to stay, if not formed into a new conference? “This is the only thing that can be done”—let us “set this off into a new conference.” Well, when will you “set this off into a new conference” *if* we transfer it to you? “Whenever this can be done.” Well, now are you *willing*, as a man of truth and honor and as a representative of your Conference, to solemnly promise for yourself and conference, that if we transfer this territory to your conference, as you

ask, you will "*set this territory off into a new conference?*" "We are perfectly willing," he says.

The solemnity of the scene, the momentous interests involved, and the binding obligations just assumed evidently suggested to Bro. Bobbitt, when he turned and looked on the S. C. delegation, the *time that he was married*, down in the old territory, and he took the occasion to refer to the fact, that he was married down there, to doubly assure their motherly minds, that *he would do to rely on*, in this *new solemn trust*, he was assuming *at the hands of the General Conference*.

This speech decided the matter—for the house at once took decisive action on the new conference question by tabling Dr. Shipp's amendment.

Now, after this let us hear no more twaddle about the North Carolina Conference, not "*asking* any thing of the General Conference or *promising* anything with regard to the S. C. Territory." We could not in reason have *asked* or *promised* more.

15th Fact: Dr. Shipp's amendment to let the territory remain in the S. C. Conference.

Dr. Shipp either did not think Bro. Bobbitt's plan "the only thing that could be done," or he sought to fix responsibility. Dr. N. F. Reid promptly accepted the responsibility of the N. C. Conference, accepting the territory to be formed into a new conference, as Bro. Bobbitt had promised, in his presence, by tabling Dr. Shipp's motion, to let the territory stay with the S. C. Conference.

16th Fact: Ad interim Resolution. (See Jour. p 295, 297.)

The morning session of General Conference, May 19th, 1870 closed, as Dr. Shipp's motion was tabled,

with Boundary report pending, to meet at 3½ o'clock in the afternoon, at which time it met and after the Journal was read, Bishop Pierce took the chair, and the Boundary question was resumed, and the report of the committee, with regard to the line between the N. C. and S. C. Conferences, was adopted, and the Shelby and Charlotte Districts were thus turned over, at the urgent request of our delegates, to be set off into a new Conference, according to the solemn promise of Bro. Bobbitt. As an annual Conference cannot form a Conference, without authority from the General Conference, two of the brethren, as we will see hereafter, was understood between some of the delegates before the report came from the boundary committee, would be done, if the new Conference was not formed at that session of the General Conference, set to work the same afternoon session that the territory was transferred, to enable the N. C. Conference to do what Bro. Bobbitt had promised for it should be done, and the following resolution was brought forward and introduced by Dr. F. M. Kennedy of the S. C. Conference, and Dr. N. F. Reid of the N. C. Conference:

“Resolved, That the N. C. Conference is hereby authorized to form a Western N. C. Conference, ad interim, if in their judgment, the interest of the church requires it in the next four years—the presiding Bishop concurring.

When these two brethren—one from each Conference immediately interested—read their resolution, all were so well satisfied that it simply meant authority to do, just what the N. C. Conference had that very day through her representative promised, so clearly, and solemnly to do, that not one word of objection or criticism was offered.

17th Fact: Extract from an Open Letter of Rev.

Dr. A. M. Shipp to Rev. Dr. N. F. Reid. (See R. E. Methodist, Oct. 1870:)

"This whole question of the new Conference goes back of all General Conference action, and rests upon the basis of solemn stipulation, a part from which, no proper understanding of the matter can be had, or any satisfactory decision reached.

Early in the session of the late General Conference, as you will remember, a meeting of the delegations of the Holston, the South Carolina, and the North Carolina delegations, was called by the North Carolina delegation through you as their chairman. At this meeting, convened under your call, you proposed on the part of your delegation (all of them who were present assenting to the same) a new Conference in Western N. C. to consist of the Salisbury District and all of the territory in N. C. held by the Holston and S. C. Conferences, and at the same time, with proper reference to the sore evils that followed the territorial dispute of 1850 as the reasons therefor you did solemnly agree, in behalf of the N. C. delegation, that no steps should be taken in this matter or any other relating to the territory of the South Carolina Conference that were not in perfect accordance with the wishes of the South Carolina delegation, and in fact agreeable all around. This solemn engagement on the part of the N. C. delegation thus publicly made was accepted by the S. C. delegation as entirely trustworthy, and we reposed upon it with fullest confidence. Accordingly, two decisions made by our delegation in regular meeting on propositions proceeding from the N. C. delegation, and reported back in the confident belief that no active measures beyond were demanded for protection against results offensive to us or distasteful to our people. These decisions were as follows, viz: 1. To cede our territory in N. C. to go into the new Conference which was proposed at the aforementioned meeting of the delegations, and when this failed through the dissent of Holston. 2. To cede our territory to go into a new Conference to be independent of Holston, either at the General Conference, or ad interim, at the discretion of the N. C. delegation, but to resist a simple transfer because not in accordance with the wishes of our people."

Here is "more light." Here we see why Dr. Walker, a member of the S. C. Conference, moved in the boundary committee to transfer the N. C. territory of his Conference to N. C. Conference, instead of moving to

let it remain in the S. C. Conference, where it had always been and was satisfied and even anxious to remain, if it could not go into a new Conference, viz: *It was to comply with a "proposition" which had "proceeded from the N. C. delegation"* to his delegation and *accepted* by his delegation, "To cede his territory to go into a new Conference to be formed independent of Holston either at the General Conference, or ad interim, at the discretion of the N. C. delegation"—the first part of the plan for a new Conference having "failed" in the committee "through the dissent of Holston." Here we see also something of the origin of the *Resolution of authority, ad interim*, which was brought forward as soon as the territory was transferred (same afternoon session) and what Dr. Reid meant when he claimed that the adoption of the report of the committee, transferring the territory, would "settle the question forever," and what Dr. Bobbitt meant when he assured the General Conference that that was the "best and only thing that could be done," and promised so solemnly to "set this off a new Conference," viz: *It was a proposition which came from the N. C. delegation to the S. C. delegation and was accepted by the S. C. delegation, and reported back to the N. C. delegation by them as accepted that if the first part of the plan to form a new Conference failed through the dissent of Holston that the S. C. Conference territory in N. C. was "to go into a new Conference to be formed independent of Holston, either at the General Conference, or ad interim, at the discretion of the N. C. delegation," and the N. C. delegation preferred ad interim as the time for its formation.*

Now, brethren, I might well close this discussion here—for every right minded person who has followed

closely my facts and arguments will more than agree that I have proven the position I took in my speech on the transfer question. I hope when you read the speech of Dr. Bobbitt and the letter of Dr. Shipp, and see their bearing on this question you will forgive me for telling my District Conference the truth about the transfer of the Shelby and Charlotte Districts, and I forgive you the injustice you have done me, as I do not believe you were aware of all the facts I here have shown you. But I promised;

18th Fact: Resolutions of Shelby District Conference held in Charlotte Sept. 1st, 1870. (See R. E. Methodist of Sept. 1870.

“Whereas the last session of the Gen. Conference transferred the territory of the S. C. Conference within the State to the N. C. Conference, with authority to set off a Western N. C. Conference at the next session of that body, if the interests of Methodism or the wishes of our people demand it, and whereas all the agitation among our people before the Gen. Conference, with the exception of one appointment, was in reference to a *new Conference* and *not a transfer*, therefore

Resolved, That this District Conference hereby respectfully, but earnestfully requests the N. C. Conference at the next session to set off, with the consent of the presiding Bishop, the Western N. C. Conference with an equitable Eastern boundary, in view of the prospective addition of the territory in N. C. West of the Blue Ridge. *Resolved*, That our Holston brethren within the State of N. C. are hereby cordially invited to unite with us as early as practicable in the complete formation of said Western N. C. Conference.”

Bro. P. L. Hermon, and others, who were present at this District Conference write me that Drs. Reid, Craven and Shipp were present and that the above resolutions passed unanimously.

I introduce the above resolutions to show that the preachers and people of the territory understood the object of the transfer to be a *new Conference* and that

they "*demand*ed," by this expression of their "wishes," that it be set off at the next Conference.

I have an article from Dr. A. A. Scroggs, published in the Organ of our Conference, Oct. 19th, 1870, which says the other District Conference of the S. C. Conference territory, held at Marion, N. C., passed a resolution also demanding to be set off into a new Conference at the next session of the N. C. Conference.

17th Fact. A declaration of Dr. Shipp on floor of Greensboro Conference among remarks at his introduction to the Conference in 1870:

"I could but regard a failure of the N. C. Conference to set off a Western N. C. Conference a breach of faith."

I present this fact to show those who remember so well and pleasantly Dr. Shipp's *burlesque* "*poetry*" at the close of the Conference, that his true view of the matter was to be found in his solemn asseveration at the beginning of the session which many of us remember with equal distinctness

20th Fact: Statement of Bishop G. F. Pierce at Greensboro Conference in 1870.

Bishop Pierce stated to Dr. J. W. North, and others after he reached Greensboro to hold our first Conference, after the S. C. Conference territory was transferred to us:

"In view of the action of the last General Conference I came to Greensboro with the full expectation of setting off a Western Conference at this session and I am surprised that the N. C. Conference is not ready for it."

We must bear in mind that Bishop Pierce was not only as well informed, as to the affairs, and as deeply interested in all the movements of our whole Church, as any one in it, but that he was the very Bishop who was in the chair in General Conference when the terri-

tory was transferred and the resolution of authority to form a new Conference given to the N. C. Conference. No wonder then he "viewed the action" of General Conference, "came with full expectation" and was "surprised to find the N. C. Conference not ready for it."

I here close my presentation of historical facts for the present, believing that I have given sufficient evidence to satisfy any reasonable mind that the object of the transfer of the Shelby and Charlotte Districts was the formation of a new Conference, but if my brethren of the opposition still doubt and the Editor of the *Advocate* will find room, I have many more facts of the same sort, along the same line, showing the same thing and I think I will be able to satisfy any one who will be convinced of a thing that he does not prefer.

If you agree with me in the above, then you must agree with me in my conclusion that we as a Conference are in truth and honor bound to carry out that trust committed to us by the General Conference. The authority given us by the General Conference to set off a new Conference expired at the end of four years by *our neglect*. That was not the fault of any one, but the N. C. Conference. We had *all* the time we asked the General Conference to give us to carry out our promise. If our note went out of date by our neglect, we are not going to plead our neglect as the reason we should be released from the obligation of carrying out the trust we have assumed. Certainly not. You cannot compromise a moral obligation—you can just as well say you can do right in doing wrong. A matter in which there is or is not any moral obligation involv-

ed "compromised," and the compromise "rescinded," leaves the matter just where it was before the compromise was made. This new Conference formation can never be properly compromised.

1. Because there is moral obligation involved. 2. Because our relation to the trust is a fiduciary one established by a Conference session which has expired forever. Therefore we stand as a Conference just as we did the moment the territory was transferred to us, soon after Bro. Bobbitt, our representative, had agreed for us to set the territory off into a new Conference if the General Conference would transfer it to us and before the resolution authorizing the N. C. Conference to set it off, viz : With all our obligation upon us, and promise remaining to set it off, yet without authority to set it off. Now, I am in favor of asking the Gen. Conference to help us to carry out our solemn trust to divide the N. C. Conference and set off this territory into a new Conference. I do not claim to be better than many of my brethren, yet I do contend, as individuals, and as a Church in N. C., we cannot afford to bury this solemn trust out of sight—just to suit the convenience of a few. We cannot go before the Gen. Conference in our representatives and say in order to have desirable territory transferred to us, we are perfectly willing to do a thing, and then after that Conference is adjourned, hold on to it for 15 years and then oppose the doing of what we ought to have done long ago. Let us now do what our representative said we were "perfectly willing" to do.

The rest of my reply will be brief. as my reviewers said but little to meet the other arguments in my speech.—*Goldsboro, N. C., Sept. 17th, 1885.*

REASONS FOR DIVIDING.

ARTICLE THIRD.

The reader, as we progress, will perceive, that the same spirit of unfairness and desperation, characterizes the extended notice of my speech by my censors, from beginning to end. In my second propositions I affirmed that *Our Conference is too large to be easily and suitably entertained in our towns.* Bro. Adams says: "No this is not so, and the facts sustain my assertion." In the face of this flat contradiction, he at once admits, that to now provide for our Conference does require "an effort," "some sacrifice" and "inconvenience." That is what I contend, only I say it take, *too much* of an "effort, sacrifice and inconvenience," and therefore the Conference should be put in proportions, so that it would not require *too much*. One of the special characteristics of a bore—either ecclesiastical or otherwise—is a stupid insensibility to the fact of the amount of "effort," "sacrifice" and "inconvenience" to which he is subjecting other people—and my two brethren seem to be, even now, very *far gone* in that direction.

I did not say it was impossible to entertain our Conference in the State—I said it was *barely possible*. I admit that an *expert* in Conference—providing like Bro. Cunnegim, if you will give him a large circle of rich hospitable country around the place, can by doing little else, obtain homes for all in a month or two—for at least one session during the life of an inexperienced generation. One of our then young undergraduates in the Conference tells me, that Bro. C. assigned him

a home at Wilson *six miles* out in the country! No one but an expert would have thought that was "close to the committee room", or knew how to hold so many "homes in reserve" and sent a brother out so far. You know there are some who can walk a rope, and others who are great at feats of jugglery—they generally call them *Professors*, I believe they are *experts*. I was not referring, when I said it was "barely possible" to one of these specially skilled and gifted men, called experts, at all. It had not then occurred to me, that the N. C. Conference had gotten so large and unmanageable, among the little towns of our State, that it had become a necessity, to employ an expert, to provide for its entertainment. But it seems that the last 15 years have only discovered *one* expert among us, and we have put him at something else, and as a resort to keep from dividing the Conference, we are now at the last extremity. We see another evidence of the terrible strait our brethren are in, by looking at the flimsy, jejune attempts of Bros. Adams and Chaffin, in trying to meet the arguments my speech presented. If these grave, law-loving brethren had not been reduced almost, or quite, to desperation, they would not have both drawn out different Conference directories of the Wilmington session and referred their brethren to them, as authority, for the size of the N. C. Conference, instead of the Discipline and Conference Minutes. As they seem to differ widely, I do not know how they got up two directories for the same session, nor how many they still have behind, nor how much their reserved ones differ. A Conference directory, is a little sheet gotten out a few days before the session meets, usually edited by the pastor of the church where the session is to be held, containing the names

and homes, &c. of those who have been provided for, *up to the time* the paper goes to press. The very tentative nature of the sheet, arranged for a week's convenience among the members and citizens, and the circumstances, which surround its getting up, and the time at which it has to be brought out; render it out of the question with any thoughtful person, as even a reliable approximation to the size of the Conference, much less *reliable to quote*. The Discipline tells us those whose *duty* it is to attend Conference and the Minutes of the preceeding year, show us the supplies and probationers whose *business* it is to attend. The number of those who seek ordination on admission, whose business it is to be present, and the wives of preachers privileged from a right custom, to come when they wish, is varied and can only be approximated by an average of a few years. It is here the directory of Bro Adams shows that my estimate, 370, was a very correct one. I got mine from the disciplinary Conference Roll and from the Minutes and from observation through years. Bro. Adams says his Directory shows there were only 3 supplies provided for at Wilmington—then I say 6 were left off who ought to have been provided for, as they were down in the Minutes as in *charge of work*. Bro. Adams says his Directory shows only 30 wives were provided for at Wilmington. Several years ago I provided for as many as 56. I have as much right to take what I know in my case, as the figures of a little sheet already seen to be defective. To take my year as a test then according to Bro. Adams' showing we have now to provide for at least 372 and my speech claimed 370.

Bro. Adams is wonderfully agitated over my saying we ought to have 3 more Districts in the next 4 years.

If he will take our 182 pastoral charges and divide them by 12 and then divide six of our overgrown circuits and then take up 4 of the missions we have thrown out of our large Districts he will find that we now have the 3 new Districts, if laid off, and could give them then every one 4 Quarterly Meetings for every pastoral charge, embracing the Sabbath. I am glad our brother claims to feel an interest in the growth of our Church—the depth of which desire of his I will test before we are through. The next attempt of Bro Adams at an argument on the entertainment question is: “One thing is certain there has always been a place for the Conference to meet and it has always been suitably entertained.” By the very same logic, you see, he could demonstrate he will live to be older than Methuselah! He has lived 50 years, therefore, he will live 999! Again. He refers me, as a clincher, to the Baptist Convention of 600 delegates. There is scarcely any analogy between the two bodies. From what I have seen, I do not suppose more than half of the Baptist Convention attend, or a third remain over Sabbath. As theirs is really a *Convention* and not a Conference and varies somewhat according to its locality, it has been held in the last five years in Warrenton and Edenton. It is therefore absurd to try to draw an argument from the size of the Baptist Convention. I am sorry for brother Adams—he does try so hard to find an argument, and fails—and Bro. Chaffin leaves off even correct spelling—calls onerous “onorous.”

They both seem to find themselves so much at a loss for a good reason with which to bolster their broken-backed cause, that they pass without hope or courage to notice my argument showing our Conference is so

large it is impossible from the very nature of the case for it to meet well the object of a Conference, viz: *To confer together so as to better understand and perform the work of the Church.* They pass, in the same way, almost, my demonstration that the division of the Conference would secure the better making of the appointments of the preachers. They pause at my argument in favor of reducing the size of our Conference territory so as to reduce the *expenses* of our preachers in *attending Conference and moving to their work.*

I must confess, if I did not know the names of these brethren over their articles, I would not believe they were capable of trying to palm off any such discreditable stuff, as grave arguments, on a serious question. Bro. Chaffin claims that the traveling expenses of the preachers are all paid by their circuits and stations, and what completes the farce, calls on the laymen to answer the question, if it is not so. After this, you need not be surprised if he expects Bishop Soule to hold our next Conference, as the custom, to which the brother alludes, has been, we may say, dead as long as the good old Bishop. Well, this really sounds strange to some of our men, who have been selling their horse, or buggy, or both, to get money to move to their work! Bro. Chaffin here slips out, unawares to himself, the discovery that he has not moved in so long, that he knows nothing comparatively of the cause he is trying to support. I do not suppose he, or brother Adams, either, has paid the sum of ten cents in ten years, to move their families to their work. They are what we term, by way of distinction, local-itinerants; who have their own fixed homes, and, as I am glad they can, keep their families fixed down and seldom, if ever, move. While I am glad they are so fortunate in

their circumstances. It seems remarkable that it did not occur to them, that they are the *wrong men* to insist on those who are less fortunate continuing to bear an unnecessary expense in moving. I say, it is well enough for the brethren of the Conference to take notice, that these two brethren, who do not pay, or expect to pay a cent to move, and, who do not go, or expect to go into either of our extremes of climate, are the *very men*, who make on me the longest and most vindictive assault, for trying to lessen the burdens and dangers of my brethren and their families and at the same time advance the real interests of Christ's Kingdom. I said in my speech it does not hurt a man much to move, who does not have to move, or pay the expenses of those who do—and now you see the truth of this sentence practically exemplified with the men's *names signed to it*. I confess, I have but little admiration for a zeal, which looks to holding burdens on others, we do not expect to help bear ourselves. It will be a sad, sad day when our church and ministerial brotherhood accept a principle like this, as the *prevailing* one. These liberal brethren ask us to throw away *unnecessarily* in moving in the next four years \$8,800. *Will you do it?* Bro. Adams thinks, he would have us believe, that the extra \$4,400 for going to an undivided Conference would be well spent in the extra traveling we would enjoy. He instances the fact, that among other things, we novices got to see last Conference, a "*cotton compress*." Yes, we may see a "*cotton compress*" *again* the 25th of November in Charlotte for our extra \$1,100. You brothers, from Columbia and Portsmouth, who will have to pay about \$25 to get to Conference, if you should happen to be read out for Columbus or Roaring river Mission, for the next year, and have to go

back after your wives and take them to your work, and then wait till the next Conference for your Do. Miss. money, you will never want to see Bro. Adams' "compress" again—you will feel like you and wife have been *in* the thing, *all over*, for twelve months!

Bro Chaffin thinks "climatic extremes" are a good thing to have in a Conference. Yes, you may see he does—for *other folks*—he is not himself *seeking to enjoy them*. He does not *need* them you see—

Bro. Adams has had the delectable privilege of a Conference use of the climatic extremes a little and he touches the merits of the question very lightly indeed. He vents all his fury at what I said and not what I proved. He objects to my saying that God in his government of matter, indicates to us, how matter should be governed and that we should accept, as rational creatures, these indications of our Maker, as the pointing of his finger to direct us in our plans for the good of men and the glory of God. He certainly believes and practices this very thing, if religion and science are any use to him. I do not see why a man can not take these along in looking for a Conference line as well as in everything else. He certainly will not allow his lack of an argument to resist a plain truth make him an infidel! If my desperate cause required any such alternative I would abandon it, as I would throw off a cold coiled serpent if I were Bro. Adams.

Now brethren, there is no use for any one to deny that sudden subjections of unacclimated persons, for a year or two, to a change of climatic extremes will endanger health, and this danger ought to be wisely and mercifully obviated in our Conference by leaving our brethren, by a division, only liable to be brought in contact with one of these extremes. If you believe

this doctrine you ought to be willing for your own good and the greater peace and safety of your brethren and their families to unite in reducing as much as possible this danger. If you believe there is nothing in this doctrine, I submit in all fairness, that *you are the very man* for Bishop Keener to take for the very *next experiment* to be made on this subject. Speak out and let us know—we are about all converted down this way.

CHIEF REASON FOR DIVISION.

ARTICLE FOURTH.

MR. EDITOR: The chief proposition and argument of my speech was: *The spread and strengthening of Christ's Kingdom demand a division of the N. C. Conference.* This, I argued from the polity and aim of Methodism, facts in Methodist history and utterances of the N. C. Conference. Bro. Chaffin admits that if my proposition is true it "settles the question of division forever." I repeat, that it is not only true, but that it ought to have settled the question long before this, in the mind of every man, who loves Christ's cause and desires to save souls from death. "If I forget thee O Jerusalem let my right hand forget her cunning." I showed from the Minutes of our Conference, that our Conference has begun a decline in soul-saving. I did not simply take a year or two to test the question, but the two halves of the last ten years and contrasted them, and as may be seen, the examination shows, that our increase has fallen off in the last five years, SEVEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVEN! Bro. Adams seems to be so completely overwhelmed by this demonstration in favor of division, or so absorbed in some subordinate interest, which he dare not mention in this connection, that he passes this sad revelation without one word of comment. Why does he do this? Does he not see that at our present rate it will take only a few years for us to have a very great loss in our membership? Are we willing to put our denomination in that relative position among the denominations of the State? Are we willing to subordinate the

Church of God to our inferior interest? What is preaching, Church or Conference *for*, if not for soul-saving? If we do not move speedily to readjust our forces the General Conference will have to turn over into our hands a few more Districts from the borders of our sisters, to keep up the pride of a new born sentimentality which seems willing to flourish on the labors of others—but unwilling to use the means necessary to our own success. Greater efficiency in soul-saving generally follows a proper division of a large Conference. Then it would follow a right division of our Conference—the largest and most unwieldy in the whole connection of Conferences. Where is the consistency, wisdom or religion in refusing to apply the remedy Methodism has provided for just such cases as ours, and the one that has been uniformly efficacious? Why throw ourselves with all the subordinate weight we can lug in, on the back of our grand old denomination, to hinder her efforts to readjust herself to her task of soul-saving and soul-elevating in the world?

You may see how trivial and subordinate the question of soul-saving seems to have become in the mind of Bro. Adams from the way he tries to dodge the force of my argument drawn from the result of the division of Methodism in Ga. I showed that a division of Ga. Methodism since the war has resulted in a net increase nearly, or quite, double that of the N. C. Conference for the same time. He seeks to meet that argument by showing that one of the divided Ga. Conferences has grown about as large as ours. He must either be in a sad strait for an argument, or think his readers have very feeble intellects—for the very fact that that Conference has grown by division so rapidly

is one of the very best practical evidences that if we were divided our Conferences and their institutions, would prosper in the same way. Bro. Adams to find some plausible pretext for not dividing the N. C. Conference would evidently lead his readers to believe that our Conference is not the largest Conference in the Church, South. That which determines the size of an annual Conference as a part of the Church is 1. The number of its Church members and 2. Its pastoral charges. The number of its preachers is necessarily varied according to a number of contingent circumstances. Our Conference might have had many more preachers if we had taken in a part of those we have turned from our door. As a Conference we now have over three thousand more members than any other Conference in the M. E. Church, South—notwithstanding Bro. Adams' attempt to stand down very low as he measures himself. If we were to wait four years longer before dividing, I have no doubt Bro. Adams would be ready to go around and point out to us the fact that we need not divide, then, for as he will show us, there will be a number of his sisters a head taller than he will ever be—as he is grown and beginning to shrink up! You see in the case of the division of Methodism in Georgia, Bro. Adams has already begun to plead the ruinous results of his own policy as a reason why that very policy should be continued!

UTTERANCES OF THE SALISBURY CONFERENCE OF 1877.

Bro. Chaffin says: "Bro. M. makes no reference whatever to the resolution"—in the report of the Division Committee unanimously adopted by that Conference. By reading my speech you will see that I *did* do, exactly, what Bro. Chaffin says I did *not* do. As I

was discussing in my speech the reasons for division adopted as reasons by our Conference for the spread of Christ's Kingdom and was not arguing the diplomatic plan of the Conference selected to obtain a new Conference, as the report embraced nearly a page of our Conference Minutes in small type, I only discussed the reasons down to embrace what the report stated was the "*chief*" reason presented in it, and then told you what followed in the report in the following language: "Then follows a reference to the universality of the wish for a division and then a reference to a line and then a resolution memorializing the General Conference to meet in Atlanta to divide us." As Bro. Chaffin seems to have lost his spectacles and cannot read my speech as I wrote it, I now leave him to meditate why he did as you see he did above—as *he walks his tether around his local stake.*

Bro. Adams says the Salisbury "report is too long to transcribe." I suppose he meant too long for *him* as he seems unwilling to allow me the same privilege he took, and asks. "Why did Bro. Mann fail to give" the memorial? I will here ask Bro. Adams if he was going to perform what I had left undone in the matter of the Salisbury report, *why he did not give the special ground set forth in that report as the condition on which the Holston territory was asked for?* Why did you pass over it, as if it had not been there, to write down that which the report tells you was based on it? Here it is verbatim:

"Finally it is believed that with the transfer of the State territory lying within the bounds of the Holston Conference, if no more is obtained, we would have material enough to form two respectable Conferences. We have in the Eastern Division about 36,000 church members and 100 pastoral charges; in the Western about 25,000 church members and

70 pastoral charges. These numbers would make both Conferences larger than 20 of the other Conferences in the M. . Church, South. It would make the Eastern about the 6th and the Western about the 7th on our list of Conferences. With these reasons stated your committee submit the following: *Resolved, &c."*

You see here from this that the special ground fixed in the report on which it tells you that division and a new Conference were asked for, was *61,000 church members and 170 pastoral charges*. These then formed the real and only true condition of the memorial. From the fact that these numbers are stated here as being material enough to form two new respectable Conferences and the Conferences are measured by this material with the other Conferences, leaves the plain inference that so far as the N. C. Conference was then concerned, the *only* prerequisite necessary for division and a new Conference was 61,000 church members and 170 pastoral charges, and if we had had these in our own "400 miles" and "too large" territory we would not have regarded a transfer of any other territory as necessary to the formation of a new Conference. You will see that the report deplored the too great amount of territory it had for one Conference and stated while it readily gave up the idea of the Virginia territory that what it needed was members and pastoral charges and asked for the Holston territory in our State with that special reason stated as the ground. Therefore the ground on which this memorial stands and must stand is the certainty of receiving, or having, 61,000 church members and 170 pastoral charges in order for us to be willing to divide and have two Conferences. Then it must stand on the same condition now. Then as a Conference we are *more than willing* to divide *now*, because we now have in our own 400 miles

territory 74,888 church members and 182 pastoral charges. Then the Salisbury report and memorial based on the same condition must ask for the Va. and Holston territory in our State, to obtain them, if we can, but if these can not be secured from the General Conference, ask it to equitably divide the present territory into two Conferences. Then Bro. Adams if you understood that Salisbury report and memorial you referred to, so often, we are not so very far from agreeing on the division question after all. I am a little of the opinion you spoke in your agitation a little too hasty about the document and from other things you wrote had not well considered the whole thing, but as you deliberately invite me to come to you and both stand on to it, I therefore accept your invitation given in these plain words: "*Then let Bro Mann come and take a stand at my side and we will both stand on that report, and together we will stand or together we will fall.*" Then Bro. Adams and myself are both on the Salisbaay report—*side by side*. Well my brother as we have both been writing about this report let us read and write it together so we, and our brethren, may see where we really do stand. Here it is memorial and all:

"The committee is unanimous in the opinion that the time has come when the Conference should be divided into two Conferences. The reasons for this opinion are the following: 1st. It is palpable to all that the Conference has grown too large and burdensome to be entertained at our annual sessions, except in a very few of our largest cities; while many of our smaller towns, both in the East and in the West, anxious to extend to us their hospitality, are deprived of the privilege and the blessing accruing from our gathering. 2d. The territory of our present Conference stretches over a scope of country about 400 miles in length, embracing two totally dissimilar climates, which endanger the health of the preachers who do not remain long enough in either to become acclimated; and furthermore, this length of travel forces upon them bills of heavy expenses, which

diminish the small pittance left them after their necessary expenses are paid at home. 3rd, and *chiefly*. It is believed that the spread of the Gospel will be promoted by this measure. There is a large strip of country lying between this and the Holston Conference which will never be properly cultivated until a new Conference stretches over it; besides many corners and nooks in the mountains that will not probably be reached except through a new Conference. Furthermore, it is well known that the division of large Churches and circuits tends to more rapid development and fruitfulness, and this is equally true in reference to Conferences. Fourthly, The division seems to be a foregone conclusion—a mere question of time. The people of Western Carolina have spoken out for it on both sides of the Blue Ridge in their official meetings. The growing numbers will soon force it upon us and this is the peculiarly auspicious time lest the territory we need slip from our hands. Finally, it is believed that with the transfer of the State territory lying within the bounds of the Holston Conference, if no more is obtained, we would have material enough to form two respectable Conferences. We have in the Eastern Division about 36,000 church members and 70 pastoral charges; in the Western about 25,000 church members and 70 pastoral charges. These numbers would make both Conferences larger than 20 of the other Conferences in the M. E. Church, South. It would make the Eastern about the 6th and the Western about the 7th on the list of our Conferences. With these reasons stated your committee submit the following: *Resolved*, That we as a Conference memorialize the General Conference to meet in Atlanta, Ga. in May next, to transfer to the North Carolina Conference all the territory in the State of N. C., within the bounds of the Va. and Holston Conferences. But if in the wisdom of that Body they should refuse the request to transfer us the territory of the Va. Conference in this State and will transfer us the territory of the Holston Conference within this State, we request that a division be made, the line running along the Eastern boundaries of the Charlotte and Salisbury Districts on the East and with the State lines of N. C., westward."

I have given you above the report and memorial Bro. Adams and myself are standing on. Of course the report and memorial must be conformed to the truth of history of the present time, as it was to the time it was written. Then we must say Richmond instead of

Atlanta, and change the figures in the conditional reason so as to make that paragraph say 74,888 church members and 182 pastoral charges, instead of 61,000 church members and 170 pastoral charges, and show that we were in earnest when we said we were willing to divide with the former numbers by adding to the memorial, that *if the General Conference refuse to transfer us any of the territory of other Conferences lying within our State, we request that a division be made of the present territory of the N. C. Conference.* We must also conform the manifestations of desire on the part of the Holston territory to the truth.

Bro. Adams states the "leading thought of the above report is division." Yes, you may see it is—one of the strongest division documents I have ever read. I hope all will read it and remember it was the unanimous utterance of the preachers of the N. C. Conference 8 years ago and Bro. Adams and myself stand on it now. Yes, Bro. Adams—S. D., is for division, according to his own statement, whatever devious paths his pen may have trod since that man carried that printed matter so unexpectedly to the Fayetteville District Conference, he now says, as you may see from the report he is standing on: "*The time has come when the Conference should be divided into two Conferences*—it is palpable to all that the Conference has grown too large and burdensome to be entertained at our annual sessions, except in a very few of our largest cities." This is what Bro. Adams now says—and I say so too—for I am standing "*at his side.*" He says also: "It is believed the spread of the Gospel will be promoted by this measure"—that the "division of Conferences tends to more rapid development and fruitfulness"—that "division is a foregone conclusion." You see he has come

out of the fog after all and stands boldly out for division. Well my brother if you do not backslide we will all forgive you for once seeming only to depart from the faith. You see we stand "*side by side*"—there are quite a number standing with us on the report of the Salisbury Conference. *Get up the old memorial and we will conform it to the present and send it up again.*

Now, my brother, I wish to say to you, if I have used any expression which pained you, I am sorry for it and permit me to say that there were two phrases in the first article of my reply in *quotation* marks, which I did not intend to put down as your language. I did not intend to say you used the language "glaring misrepresentation of facts." If I have done any brother injustice I ask his pardon—for neither my heart nor cause demand anything but *truth and right*.

SUPPLEMENTARY THOUGHTS.


Opposition to division, in the N. C. Conference, originated in, and is fostered by a subversion of the Divine *order* of gospel principles defining the *position* and *relative importance* of the different church *interests* in God's plan for evangelizing and saving the world. God, who gave the Church and calls ministers, located in his plan SOUL SAVING, as the great *first* interest, to be subserved by all others. Jesus himself came, and died to save sinners. We, as ministers are not commissioned and sent out, to subvert God's gospel order of Church interests—but *to save sinners from perishing*. As our sufficiency is of God, we must keep our Church interests in harmony with the order of the gospel system. In 1877 we were all, as may be seen by the report and memorial we adopted unanimously at Salisbury, in remarkable accord with the true Gospel order of interests. We all, as preachers, held up our hands to say, that the "spread of the Gospel" was our great "chief" interest, and as we believed it "would be promoted" by a division of our Conference, we asked the General Conference to give us the Holston territory, so that we could have 61,000 members, and divide us. Something, other than soul saving, was lugged in, to defeat that memorial, and since then, there are those among us, who are ready to urge the College, the paper and even their admiration for the eminent bigness of the Conference, as a reason why, we should not divide, even though we are declining in our increase in soul saving. Are not all these subornate things, less important in the eyes of God, than one soul? Are not these impertinent estimates of subordinate things insulting to the Holy Spirit? Do we not recognize the the fact, that these

inferior interests, however dear they may be to us, can never prosper and answer well their real purpose in the Church, until they are brought into subordination and held by us, as only the proper helps of the greater-ruling interest, soul saving? This is the way to put them, and ourselves, in the God intended line of efficiency and prosperity. If you keep them out of their proper place, you will cripple them as Church interests and make them instruments of injury to the real interests of the Church. If you are a real friend of TRINITY COLLEGE, seek to make it the joint property and only male College of two harmonious and vigorous N. C. Conferences. Look at Emory as the foster child of the two Ga. Conferences! If you will put Trinity in that position, God will raise her up and move to her, all the friends she needs, and money to meet all her wants. If you wish to destroy Trinity, as a Church property, you have but to make her the only admitted pretext for keeping the already divided Conference bound together, merely by an ecclesiastic band for four years more, and you will succeed effectually. Eight years ago, as preachers, we were a unit on the question of division. Then we were a united Conference—were we not? Now, who has divided it—those who have held on to their matured convictions, or those who have gone away from their comrades and expressed convictions? It is clear to see, then, that those, who are now opposed to division, have not only subverted all Gospel order, but *they have divided the Conference* in sentiment and conviction, so that, it is impossible to have harmony of views again, without drawing the line and letting those, who have the same convictions, be placed together. It is idle, to talk of waiting for a greater unanimity in the Conference on the sub-

ject of division. We had entire unanimity once, but we threw away our opportunity, and it will never return again, for we are divided now, as to what is the chief interest of the Church, that all other interests should subserve. Quite a number now evidently hold, while they do not openly declare it, that our CONFERENCE ORGAN is the great interest, which is to be regarded of paramount importance in the question of division. I can not for the life of me see it in that light. I have always appreciated it, and worked for it as a newspaper, and voted for it as our Conference Organ but I never thought it was the chief thing for which Christ died, or the special object of my call to the ministry. I have only regarded it as a valuable gospel help, worth to its owner about \$5,000, and that its usefulness and profits, if it is held faithfully in its subordinate place, as an interest, would be enhanced, rather than impaired by a division of the Conference. If in the change necessary for the good of the Church, the paper should lose 5 or 10 per cent. of its subscription list, that would not be more than many of our 200 brethren in the field sacrifice every year, for the good of the Church. Therefore, the paper interest should have nothing to do in settling the question of division—and will not have anything to do in the matter, unless, some of us become so prejudiced we are incapable of reasoning—or some selfish and designing person seeks, to make use of a subordinate interest, to serve his own personal ends—instead of the Church of God. But having been associated with Methodist preachers and laymen all my days, I have too much respect for their intelligence and manhood, and too high an estimate of their piety and integrity, to believe they will allow any man to use them, or allow themselves to act on any important church question without thinking for themselves and acting in accord with their holiest convictions—which is all I ask of them—or for myself.

ADDENDA.

Though, 19 columns of criticism on myself and speech had been published by the Editor of the *Advocate* in his paper, and though, he had begun to publish my reply—as if he would publish it—and had published but two of the four articles of it, and those only referring to a preliminary proposition of my speech—and though my third article, as you have now seen was a part of my reply, covering *five* of the seven propositions of my speech, and though the friends of division had seemingly, for the time, yielded to me, by mere tacit consent, the chief advocacy of their cause, and though, it is now just before Conference action is to be had, when it is highly important both sides of the Conference question should be fairly represented, and though, it is now three weeks since he rejected the very important part of my reply, and thus, prevented my replying through the *Advocate*, where the criticisms were published—and though, two issues of his paper have since gone out, with 13 columns filled with replies to the parts of my reply published; yet, up to this, 27th day of Oct., he has not seen fit to inform his readers of the disadvantage to which he has subjected the cause and friends of division and myself. I give, in the above and in my Explanatory, the facts, according to my present understanding of them, and leave the reader to draw his own conclusion, as to why, I am shut out from the *Advocate*.

 I have read in the last two issues of the *Advocate*, the replies of brothers Adams, Bobbitt and Montgomery and call the reader's attention to the fact, that by

comparing them with my reply, he will see that my
20 "Facts" still stand as unbroken sentinels along
the line, guarding the conclusion I drew in my speech;
and will agree with me, that their assailants have failed
to overcome any one of them—*even singly*.

"Let the Truth live!"

